



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

bility. That liability arises from the character of the promise, and the interest in the principal contract and the benefit to be derived from it becomes a matter of consideration only as they may serve to determine that character. *Clay v. Walton*, 9 Cal. 328. The vital point in cases of this class is: Was the contract original? *Payne v. Baldwin*, 14 Barbour 570. In order that the promise may be held to be within the statute it is essential that there be a binding and subsisting obligation or liability to the promisee to which the promise is collateral. 151 Ill. 175. The evidence required to change a contract relation between a plaintiff and a third party and to prove a promise to pay the debt of another as a new and original undertaking and not a contract of suretyship, must be clear and satisfactory; otherwise it will fall within the statute. *Haverly v. Mercer*, 78 Pa. 257. A case directly in point is *Diringer v. Moynihan*, 10 N. Y. Supp. 540, which held that a promise by defendant to see that workmen of sub-contractor were paid was a promise to pay debt of another, and, not being in writing, was unenforceable.

CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE—QUESTIONS FOR JURY.—*CRAUCH VS. BROOKLYN HEIGHTS Ry. Co.*, 129 N. Y. ST. REP. 169.—Plaintiff was injured at a grade crossing while proceeding to defendants' station—*Held*, that the fact that the plaintiff had seen a train approaching and had not waited to see if train would stop at the station, was not, under all circumstances, negligence in law.

It is established universally and beyond a doubt that negligence and contributory negligence are questions of fact for the jury, except in rare cases. *Burns v. Town of Elba*, 32 Wis. 605; *Balt. & Ohio R. R. Co. v. Shipley*, 31 Md. 370. That there are exceptional cases is unquestioned. *Tyson v. Tyson*, 37 Md. 567-581; *Balt. & Ohio R. R. Co. v. Fitzpatrick*, 35 Md. 32. But there is hopeless conflict on these cases. Compare the following: *Butler v. R. R. Co.*, 126 Pa. St. 160; *Lewis v. Balt. & Ohio R. R. Co.*, 38 Md. 588; *Brown v. Barnes*, 151 Pa. St. 562; *Moore v. Westervelt*, 21 N. Y. 103. In some states the question is controlled by the fact that the burden of showing ordinary care is put on the plaintiff. *Alger v. City of Lowell*, 3 Allen 402; *Cramer vs. City of Burlington*, 42 Iowa, 315. But see *Bradwell v. Pittsburg & West End Ry. Co.*, 139 Pa. St. 404; *Brown v. Traction Co.*, 14 Pa. Sup. Ct. 594. For a case where there is no room for doubt see *Balt. City Pass. Ry. Co. v. Wilkinson*, 30 Md. 224.

CORPORATIONS—EMINENT DOMAIN—LEGALITY OF CORPORATE EXISTENCE.—*EDDLEMAN ET UX. v. UNION COUNTY TRACTION & POWER Co.*, 75 N. E. 510 (ILL.). *Held*, that the legality of the existence of a corporation cannot be attacked in condemnation proceedings instituted by it, but only in a direct proceeding by *quo warranto*.

The better rule seems to be as announced in the opinion above. *W. & P. R. Co. v. C. & C. R. & L. Co.*, 114 N. C. 690; *Morrison v. Forman*, 161 Ill. 247; *Niemeyer v. Little Rock Junction Ry.*, 43 Ark. 111. But some courts hold that a *de jure* corporate existence must be shown when it is sought to take property by eminent domain. *In re Brooklyn W. & N. Ry. Co.*, 72 N. Y. 245; *Powers v. H. & L. Ry. Co.*, 33 Oh. St., 429; *Orrich School Dist. v. Dorton*, 125 Mo. 439. *De jure* corporate existence must be set up in actions by a corporation to collect subscriptions made prior to incorporation. *Indiana F. & M. Co. v. Herkimer*, 46 Ind. 142; *Schloss v. Montgomery Trade Co.* 87 Ala. 414. The subscriber may be estopped to attack the corporate existence if he participated in the formation of the corporation. *Bell's Appeal*,

151 Pa. St. 88; *Musgrove v. Morrison*, 54 Md. 161. In an action for subscriptions made after incorporation, *de facto* existence need not be shown. *Casey v. Galli*, 94 U. S. 673. As in eminent domain proceedings, there is also a difference of opinion as to whether *de jure* corporate existence need be shown in actions by corporations to collect assessments for benefits. That it must be shown, see *Dusenback v. Attica & B. G. Road Co.*, 43 Ind. 265. That it need not be, see *Evans v. Lewis*, 121 Ill. 478; *Reclamation Dist. No. 542 v. Turner*, 104 Cal. 334.

CRIMINAL LAW—REMARKS OF PROSECUTING ATTORNEY—ERROR.—*PEOPLE V. WOLF*, 95 N. Y. SUPP., 264.—*Held*, that the remarks of the prosecuting attorney to the jury cannot be made the basis of error where they have no tendency to create greater passion or prejudice than the admitted facts in evidence created. *McLaughlin and Ingraham, JJ., dissenting.*

As to what comments by counsel to the jury may be made the basis of error the courts are not all agreed. It has been held that intemperate language calculated to prejudice the jury and prevent a fair trial is ground for reversal. *Cargill v. Commonwealth*, 13 S. W. (Ky.) 916. But the objection to such remarks must be made promptly. *Grosse v. State*, 11 Tex. App. 364. So, also, where the accused has failed to testify in his own behalf, this may not be commented on by the prosecutor. *Price v. Commonwealth*, 77 Va. 393. Abusive language towards the defendant will be ground for reversal. *State v. Young*, 90 Mo. 666; *Stone v. State*, 22 Tex. App. 185; though the contrary has been held, *Anderson v. State*, 104 Ind. 467. But any characterization of the defendant, there being evidence to sustain such expressions, will be allowed. *State v. Brooks*, 92 Mo. 542.

DAMAGES—MENTAL SUFFERING.—*WOODSTOCK IRON WORKS V. STOCKDALE*, 39 S. W. 335 (ALA.).—*Held*, that a husband cannot recover damages for mental suffering to himself caused by the illness of his wife.

In actions for injury to persons mental suffering is an element of damage as an incident to the bodily suffering. *Chicago v. McLean*, 133 Ill. 148. But mental suffering for the injury to others is no ground of action. *Cowden v. Wright*, 24 Wend. 429; *Long v. Morrison*, 14 Ind. 595. And such has been the holding, as in the principal case, even when it is the husband's mental suffering for his wife's injury. *Hyatt v. Adams*, 16 Mich. 180. Some of the states, however, have made an exception to this rule in the case of telegraph companies, allowing a person who has suffered mental anguish through failure of delivery of a telegram to recover damages. *Relle v. Telegraph Co.*, 55 Tex. 308; *Tel. Co. v. Crocker*, 135 Ala. 492. Even in Texas, where this rule was started, it is confined to telegraph cases and exceedingly limited. *Tel. Co. v. Splar*, 126 Fed. 295. However most states decline to follow it. *Giddens v. Tel. Co.*, 111 Ga. 824.

EJECTMENT—INTEREST RECOVERABLE—MINERAL RIGHTS.—*MORAGNE ET AL V. DOE EX DEM. MORAGNE*, 39 S. E. (ALA.) 161.—*Held*, that an administrator may maintain ejectment to recover a mineral interest in lands.

"Ejectment will lie only for things whereof possession may be delivered by the sheriff." *Black v. Hepburne*, 2 Yeates 333. The thing claimed must be a corporeal hereditament. *Rowan v. Kelsey*, 18 Barb. 484. In this term have been included a room in a house, *Otis v. Smith*, 26 Mass. 293, and a real fixture, *Stancel v. Calvert*, 60 N. C. 104. But the action will not lie for a